

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed October 8, 2009, claims 8-24 and 31 were rejected. Additionally, claims 25-28 are withdrawn. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks. No claims are added or canceled.

For reference, claim 1 is amended. In particular, claim 1 is amended to recite each point (rather than all points) of the third plane being both equidistant to and between the front faces of the first and second planes. This amendment is consistent with and supported, for example, by the subject matter described in the specification at page 9, lines 8-23, and illustrated by the third plane 6 in Figs. 1-3 of the present application.

### Interview Summary

Applicants express appreciation to Examiner Angwin for allowing Applicants' representative a telephonic interview on January 6, 2010, to discuss the claims of the present application. In that interview, the language of claim 8 was discussed. In particular, a proposed amendment was discussed to overcome the current rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment, which is presented herein, appears to overcome the stated rejection, and he will review the proposed amendment in further detail upon submission of the amendment in this response.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

Claims 8-24 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as purportedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Office Action states that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. For reference, claim 1 as amended recites:

Apparatus for transferring chips from a wafer to a lead frame, comprising:

a wafer-positioning device for positioning a wafer, the wafer comprising chips surfaces thereof extending in a first plane, the first plane having a front face and a back face, the chips surfaces exposed on the front face of the first plane;

a lead frame positioning device for positioning a lead frame, the lead frame comprising a bond surface thereof, the bond surface extending in a second plane which is different from the first plane, the second plane having a front face and a back face, the bond surface exposed on the front face of the second plane, the front face of the second plane facing the front face of the first plane, either parallel ( $180^\circ$ ) or intersecting at an intersection line to form a dihedral angle of greater than  $0^\circ$  and less than  $180^\circ$ ;

a rotatable transfer assembly comprising at least two transfer heads, a first transfer head for picking up a first chip from the wafer in a chip pick-up position, and a second transfer head for bonding a second chip to the lead frame in a chip bonding position; wherein the rotatable transfer assembly is configured to concurrently rotate the first transfer head toward the chip pick-up position of the first transfer head and the second transfer head toward the chip bonding position of the second transfer head; and

a transfer assembly motor for driving the rotatable transfer assembly about an axis of rotation, the axis of rotation extending along a line in a third plane, each point of the third plane being both equidistant to and between the front faces of the first and second planes.

(Emphasis added.)

In support of the rejection, the Office Action states:

Specifically, the specification does not describe a third plane with all the points in the third plan being equidistant to both the first plane and the second plane. The examiner notes that the third plane would have to be parallel to both planes for all the points in the third plane to be equidistant to both the first plane and the second plane.

Office Action, 10/8/09, pages 3-4 (emphasis added).

Applicants submit that the reasoning presented in the Office Action in support of the current rejection is moot in light of the amendment to the claim. Specifically, the amended language of the claim clarifies that each point of the third plane is equidistant to the front faces of the first and second planes. In contrast, the amended language of the claim does not impose any restrictions or define any relationships among the various distinct points of the third plane. Moreover, Applicants submit that the amended

language of the claim is consistent with and supported by the description and illustrations of the present application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 8 based on the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

#### Dependent Claims

Claims 9-28 and 31 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 8. Applicants respectfully assert claims 9-28 and 31 are allowable based on an allowable base claim. Additionally, each of claims 9-28 and 31 may be allowable for further reasons.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: January 6, 2010

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111